

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/574,774

Applicant(s)

KAIFU ET AL

Examiner

Liam J. Heincer

Art Unit

1796

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Liam J. Heincer

(3) _____

(2) Harris Pitlick

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 May 2009

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: NA.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Pitlick correctly pointed out errors in the headings of the rejections for claims 13 and 14. It was agreed that a supplemental action with the corrected headings would be issued in order to facilitate a complete response on the part of the applicant.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Mark: Eashoo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796